

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended to overcome the rejection. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 and 6-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunson in view of Brault et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,819,624). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection by the Examiner. The Examiner characterizes Brunson as disclosing the invention but that Brunson fails to disclose that the first position where the detent lever is pivotally attached is spaced from the second position where the locking lever is pivotally attached. The Examiner then looks to Brault to teach a first position where the detent lever is pivotally attached (154) that is spaced from the second position where the locking lever is pivotally attached (146, 98). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of Brault.

The detent lever of Brault is lever 134 which is pivotally connected to lever support bracket 110 by hinge pin 154. As defined in the specification in Column 4,

beginning at line 24, the second end 146 of lever 134 is pivotally connected to the opposite end 98 of the spring member 90. Thus, detent lever 134 of Brault is pivotally connected in two places, hinge pin 154 and to end 98 of spring member 90. This entire detent system in Brault (lever 134 and spring member 90) move between a first detent lever position and a second detent lever position. Brault does not disclose, teach or suggest a locking lever pivotally attached to the table.

The locking mechanism disclosed by Brault includes a handle 222, threaded rod 218, bearing rod 190 and locking bracket 166. Handle 222 and threaded rod 218 are not pivotally connected to the table, they are rotatably connected to the table. In column 6, beginning at line 2, the locking of turntable 58 to pedestal 18 is detailed as occurring by the rotation of handle 222 and not the pivoting of a lever.

Applicant is unsure if Brault discloses a turntable 58 which is capable of rotation relative to pedestal 18. The specification states that spring member 90 includes one end 94 connected to the lower surface 30 of the turntable 58 (Column 5, lines 4-6). Lower surface 30 is the lower surface of pedestal 18 (Column 4, lines 42-45) and not turntable 58. As shown in Figures 2 and 3, lever bracket 110 is attached to turntable 58; lever 134 is attached to lever support 110; and spring 90 is connected to lever 134 at one end and pedestal 18 at its opposite end. Thus, turntable 58 is attached to pedestal 18 through lever bracket 110, lever 134 and spring 90 and thus turntable 58 cannot rotate relative to pedestal 18. Brault discloses an inoperable device which cannot be relied upon to teach anything especially the positioning of two pivot points for a detent system and a locking system.

Thus, Applicant believes Claims 1 and 11 which define the detent lever being pivotable at a first pivot position and the locking lever being pivotable at a second pivot position spaced from the first pivot position patentably distinguishes over the art of record. Likewise, Claims 2-4, 6-10 and 12-16 which ultimately depend from one of these independent claims also patentably distinguish over the art of record. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Oct 15, 2003

By: 

Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg